JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) 1 United States Attorney 2 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) **FILED** Chief, Criminal Division 3 OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104) 4 Assistant United States Attorneys APR 3 2009 5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT San Francisco, California 94102 6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Telephone: (415) 436-7241 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 7 owen.martikan@usdoj.gov **DORIGINAL** 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 12 13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CR 08-0911 MHP 14 Plaintiff. STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) 15 ORDER EXCLUDING TIME 16 v. DEON DOGAN, 17 18 Defendant. 19 20 On April 2, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for identification of 21 counsel and a detention hearing. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be 22 excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from April 2, 2009, through April 6, 2009, for 23 effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance 24 would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking 25 into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also

agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR 08-0911 MHP

26

27

28

1	interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).
2	SO STIPULATED:
3	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney
4	/s/
5	DATED:OWEN P. MARTIKAN
6	Assistant United States Attorney
7	/s/
8	DATED:RONALD C. TYLER
9	Attorney for Deon Dogan
10	9
11	[PROPOSED] ORDER
12	As the Court found on April 2, 2009, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of
13	time from April 2, 2009, through April 6, 2009, is warranted because the ends of justice served
14	by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.
15	See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny
16	defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the
17	exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C.
18	§3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).
19	
20	SO ORDERED.
21	
22	31 a Dans Dans
23	DATED: 3/209 (MON. BERNARD ZIMMERMAN)
24	United States Magistrate Judge
25	
26	
27	

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR 08-0911 MHP $\,$

28